

consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment introduced by Congressman TED POE. This amendment would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from enforcing common-sense protections against carbon dioxide pollution and other greenhouse gases from big polluters.

The underlying legislation, H.R. 1, is replete with provisions like this. Instead of eliminating tax breaks for the oil and gas industries and choosing to adhere to the scientific evidence that carbon pollution is changing the climate and endangering our health and the environment, the Republican majority's continuing resolution slashes EPA's funding by almost a third and prohibits EPA from enforcing existing greenhouse gas monitoring and reporting requirements. The bill attacks the Clean Air Act directly so that EPA will be prevented from protecting public health and fighting climate change.

The Clean Air Act has a proven 40-year track record of cutting dangerous pollution to protect human health in a cost-effective manner that spurs innovation. According to EPA, the Clean Air Act prevented an estimated 843,000 asthma attacks, 18 million cases of respiratory illness among children, 672,000 cases of chronic bronchitis, 21,000 cases of heart disease, and 200,000 premature deaths.

The Clean Air Act continues to reduce air pollution and improve the health of children, seniors, and adults: the Clean Air Act has decreased lead emissions from cars by 95 percent, decreasing by 86 percent the number of children whose development is affected by lead exposure; by requiring all new diesel engines to be more than 90 percent cleaner, EPA will prevent more than 21,000 premature deaths and \$160 billion in health costs every year by 2030; by phasing out the most dangerous ozone-depleting chemicals, EPA will cut the American incidences of non-melanoma skin cancer by 295 million by 2075; by launching the acid rain program, EPA has dramatically reduced soot and smog by levels that will reduce premature deaths by between 20,000 and 50,000 per year in 2010.

Since its enactment in 1970, the health benefits of the Clean Air Act have far outweighed industry's compliance costs, reducing toxic and health-threatening air pollutants by 60 percent while at the same time the economy grew by over 200 percent.

Now this legislation attempts to gut the Clean Air Act's pollution standards and repeal EPA's authority to limit health-threatening pollution in order to protect the profits of the big polluters.

It also prevents EPA from continuing to improve our health by updating its pollution standards and improving safeguards for public health. In addition, it repeals important Clean Air Act safeguards that are needed to create American clean energy jobs, reduce energy costs, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and increase our economic competitiveness.

It's time for us to stand up for clean air and the health of the American people rather than work for the polluters who want to interfere with EPA's efforts to reduce life-threatening pollution and turn back the clock on air quality.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and oppose the continuing resolution.

## FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 18, 2011*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Amendment, Amendment No. 199, to H.R. 1 "Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011", offered by Mr. POE of Texas and provides that none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice, or any other Agency to litigate the continuation of the case *United States of America v. The State of Arizona and Janice K. Brewer* regarding Arizona law S.B. 1070.

As a Senior Member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, I have vast experience in dealing with the issues of immigration and border security. And as a member of these committees, I can unequivocally say that this amendment and talk of supporting state immigration laws is absolutely inappropriate. It is a clear violation of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution and the long established tenets of federalism, which grant the United States government the exclusive, preemptive power to establish laws on Immigration and Naturalization.

It is necessary to oppose this amendment offered on the floor today. The Department of Justice has a federal mandate to pursue litigation in matters that constitute violations of federal law. This authority includes actions against states such as Arizona. The Arizona immigration statute appears to violate federal law and we must not strip the Department of Justice of the funding it needs to carry out its mission.

The laws of the United States do not allow state-by-state legislation of immigration policy. If we allow states to enact immigration statutes and regulate and enforce immigration policy, we would be granting permission for the separate states of our country to set up a severely disconnected patchwork of immigration laws and policies that will be extremely difficult to enforce, invite discrimination and make our country dangerously unstable and unsafe.

Our forefathers had the wisdom and insight to realize the importance of handling certain issues exclusively on a national level and saw fit to enshrine them in the Constitution. In this instance, we must not depart from the long established doctrine of exclusive federal control of immigration and naturalization. If we tread on the dangerous path of deconstruction of appropriate federal exclusivity in the area of immigration law, we will certainly force the federal courts to take corrective action and restore the exclusive role of the federal government in this area. Moreover, it would take a constitutional amendment and not the mere passage of federal or state statutes to overturn this long established legal principle.

The Department of Justice must be provided with the necessary funds to continue litigation

of its case against the state of Arizona. To do otherwise would erode the constitutional protections of our Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. Therefore I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to this amendment. Thank you Madam Chair; I yield back the balance of my time.

## FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

**HON. MIKE MCINTYRE**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 18, 2011*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Broun amendment that would eliminate funding for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers coastal projects.

Simply put—this is a "penny wise/pound foolish" effort.

Representing a coastal district I can speak first hand to the importance of coastal projects.

Beaches are of incredible economic importance to the local, state, regional, and national economy contributing nearly \$35 billion in annual Federal revenues.

There are over 2 billion visits made to our nation's beaches each year, with the Federal Government collecting \$320 per beach tourists for every \$1 spent on beach renourishment!

And more people visit our nation's beaches each year than all of our national parks combined!

North Carolina beaches create about 50,000 jobs, \$1.6 billion in spending revenues, \$78 million in state revenue and beach-related tourism provides a total payroll of \$350 million!

But the coast is also something much more important than numbers—it is a place where our batteries can be recharged, where family memories are built, and where many choose to live out the sunset of their lives.

Let's reject this amendment and support the coastal communities which support and provide much-needed employment and enjoyment for our Nation!

## FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

SPEECH OF

**HON. JON RUNYAN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 18, 2011*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes:

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Broun amendment No. 246. This amendment would prohibit the use of funds